## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

\_\_\_\_\_

X

CEMENT AND CONCRETE WORKERS DISTRICT COUNCIL WELFARE FUND, PENSION FUND, ANNUITY FUND, EDUCATION AND TRAINING FUND AND OTHER FUNDS; SILVANA BALDO, in her fiduciary capacity as Administrator of the Cement and Concrete Workers District Council Welfare Fund, Pension Fund and Annuity Fund; and ALEXANDER J. CASTALDI, as President of the CEMENT AND CONCRETE WORKERS DISTRICT COUNCIL and in his fiduciary capacity as a Trustee of the EDUCATION AND TRAINING FUND,

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Case No. 11-CV-4164 (FB) (RER)

Plaintiffs,

-against-

INTEGRATED STRUCTURES CORP. and FRANCIS A. LEE,

Dε	efen	daı	nts.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Х

## **BLOCK**, Senior District Judge:

On August 24, 2012, Magistrate Judge Reyes issued a report and recommendation ("R&R") recommending that judgment be entered against the defendants in the total amount of \$\$221,015.58, but that plaintiffs' request for permanent injunctive relief and an audit of defendants' books be denied. The R&R recited that "[a]ny objections to the recommendations made in this [R&R] must be filed . . . within fourteen (14) days of receiving this R&R," and advised that "[f]ailure to file timely objections may waive the

right to appeal the District Court's Order." R&R at 14.

The R&R was served on the defendants at their last known address on

August 24, 2012. To date, no objections have been filed.

If clear notice has been given of the consequences of failure to object, and

there are no objections, the Court may adopt the R&R without *de novo* review. *See Thomas* 

v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985); Mario v. P & C Food Mkts., Inc., 313 F.3d 758, 766 (2d Cir.

2002) ("Where parties receive clear notice of the consequences, failure timely to object to

a magistrate's report and recommendation operates as a waiver of further judicial review

of the magistrate's decision."). The Court will excuse the failure to object, however, and

conduct *de novo* review if it appears that the magistrate judge may have committed plain

error. See Spence v. Superintendent, Great Meadow Corr. Facility, 219 F.3d 162, 174 (2d Cir.

2000).

The R&R contains no error, let alone plain error. Accordingly, the Court

adopts it without *de novo* review. The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.

SO ORDERED.

FREDERIC BLOCK

Senior United States District Judge

September 25, 2012

Brooklyn, New York

2